



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

TAXATION — COLLECTION OF TAXES — COUNTERCLAIM. — *MORGANTON SCHOOL V. McDOWELL*, 72 S. E., 108 (N. C.).—*Held*, a sheriff cannot, when sued to recover the amount of taxes collected by him, set up a counterclaim against the State.

It is generally held that no set-off can be made of tax money while on the way from the tax-payer to the treasurer. *Waterbury v. Lawler*, 51 Conn., 171; *Com. v. Rodes*, 5 Mon., 318; *Wilson v. Lewiston*, 1 W. & Seg't., 428. For a tax in its essential characteristics is not a debt, or in the nature of a debt. *City of Camden v. Allen*, 2 Dutcher, 398; *Himmelman v. Spanagel*, 39 Cal., 389; *Shaw v. Pickett*, 16 Ver., 486. In *Finnegan v. City of Fernandina*, 15 Fla., 379, the Court said "debt is the subject matter of a set-off, and is liable to set-off; a tax is neither." So a sheriff cannot plead a set-off in a suit against him for taxes due and owing. *State & Guilford v. Ga. Co.*, 112 N. C., 34. The same is true of a collector of revenue. *Com. v. Rodes*, 21 Ky., 318. Nothing but a *quietus* from the auditor can be pleaded. *Com. v. Rodes*, *supra*. So where one pleads payment, the burden of proof is on him to show such payment. *Walling v. Morgan Co.*, 126 Ala., 326. But a tax collector may claim compensation due him for the services incident to the collection, but not compensation for services in a distinct office. *State v. Floyd*, 28 La. Ann., 553. Nor can he make himself a creditor against the State by purchasing claims against the State. *Frier v. State*, 11 Fla., 300.

WITNESSES—EXAMINATION—REFRESHING MEMORY.—*ERDMAN V. STATE*, 134 N. W., (NEB.). 258.—*Held*, that a newspaper reporter testifying as a witness could not refresh his memory by reference to a newspaper article based upon his original notes, the said newspaper article being a correct reproduction of his original notes. Barnes and Fawcett, JJ., *dissenting*.

The old rule that the witness must be able to swear from memory is now generally obsolete. *Downer v. Rowell*, 24 Vt., 343. The general rule is that a witness may use a memorandum to refresh his memory if he has an independent recollection of the facts. *Stewart v. Morris*, 88 Fed., 461; *Southern Ry. Co. v. State*, 165 Ind., 613. A few courts have held that an independent recollection is unnecessary. *Heyert v. Reubman*, 86 N. Y. S., 797; *Loose v. State*, 120 Wis., 115. A court reporter may give evidence from his notes even though he has no independent recollection of the facts. *Miles v. Walker*, 66 Neb., 728. A surveyor was allowed to refresh his memory from a copy of the minutes of his survey. *Miller v. Shumway*, 135 Mich., 654. The rule is established that a witness may use any memorandum or instrument to refresh his memory, provided he ultimately testifies from his own recollection as thus refreshed. *Shrouder v. State*, 121 Ga., 615; *Commonwealth v. Burton*, 183 Mass., 461; *Ascheim v. Levinsohn*, 91 N. Y. Supp., 157.